UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,280	08/04/2006	Jun Maeda	12137-0006	5009
22902 CLARK & BRO	7590 06/03/200 ODY	9	EXAMINER	
	NT AVENUE, NW		JONES, DAVID B	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3725	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/588,280	MAEDA, JUN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	David B. Jones	3725				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addres	s			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	J. nely filed the mailing date of this commur D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	-· action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the me	rits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E.						
	,					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-18	52.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
	have been received					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		NI				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •	<u> </u>				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	d in this National Stag	je			
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/4/2006 and 1/16/2009</u> .	6) Other:	• •				

Application/Control Number: 10/588,280 Page 2

Art Unit: 3725

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1 the "axial direction residual stress" has not been related to the oil well pipe. Further in claim 1, the "threaded bottom part" has not been related to the oil well pipe or the threaded joint. Yet further the "surface" and "part" of the last line of claim 1 have not been defined or structurally related to the threaded joint. Finally in claim 1 it is not clear what is being measured with the limitation of -400MPa or less as a value in X-ray stress analysis; what is the -400 MPa a measure of in such an analysis? In claim 2, - - a- - should be inserted before "hardness" on line 2. On line 3 of claim 2, "a particle diameter" lacks clear antecedent basis. Is this particle diameter the diameter of the particle sprayed in line 2 or yet another particle? Further "a surface of a material" has not been related to the threaded joint or the method. Claim 3 is alternative in nature and fails to clearly set forth the thread shape. In claims 5 and 9, "the injecting and spraying treatment" lacks clear antecedent basis and further the "incomplete threaded portion" has not be defined and related to the pipe joint. In claims 6, 8, and 10-12, like claim 5, fail to provide clear antecedent basis for "the injecting and spraying treatment".
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3725

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans '458. Evans teaches the claimed threaded pipe joint (see column 6, lines 24-42) with a peened threaded surface. Hence Evans teaches the claimed invention excepting the depth and the stress induced during the peening process. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to have manipulated the peening, recited in Evans, to arrive an optimum result depending on the workpiece to be made.

- 3. Claims 2-12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David B. Jones whose telephone number is 571 272 4518. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross, can be reached at 571 272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/588,280 Page 4

Art Unit: 3725

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David B. Jones/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3725